



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,966	12/29/2005	Sebastian Cramer	2185-233	3523
6449	7590	02/25/2009	EXAMINER	
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			SMITH, NKEISHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3632	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/562,966	CRAMER, SEBASTIAN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	NKEISHA J. DUMAS	3632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 33-62 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 55 and 59-62 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 33-54 and 56-58 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/29/2005</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following correspondence is a non-final Office Action for application no. 10/562,966 for a PIVOTING HEAD SYSTEM IN PARTICULAR FOR FILM AND VIDEO CAMERAS, filed on 12/29/2005. Claims 33-62 are pending. Claims 55 and 59-62 are withdrawn.

***Election/Restrictions***

2. Applicant's election of Figs. 1 and 3 in the reply filed on 11/10/2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

***Priority***

3. Applicant is advised of possible benefits under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), wherein an application for patent filed in the United States may be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a prior application filed in a foreign country.

4. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 34, 43, 53, 51 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 34 recites the limitation "said flat holding elementmovie" in the fourth line.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claims 43, 53 and 54 recite the limitation regarding "a central CPU." Applicant needs to fully define the term "CPU." Appropriate clarification is requested.

9. Claim 51 recites the limitation, "such that it can rotate in said horizontal plane." Applicant needs to fully define the term "it." Does the term refer to the caster wheel, caster axle or bearing ring element? Appropriate clarification is requested.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 33-35, 44-45 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beidler et al. (U.S. Pat. 1,550,944).

Regarding claim 33, Beidler teaches a pan headcamera head system (Figs. 1, 7) comprising a camera (75<sup>a</sup>) being mounted at a substantially flat holding element (74) on which there are mounted at an angular spacing about an imaginary vertical axis at least three casters (24) rotating respectively about horizontal caster axles, at least one of said caster axles being adapted to be rotated and fixed in a horizontal plane in any desired rotary position, at least one running direction adjusting device (21).

Regarding claim 34, as best understood. Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, wherein said camera is mounted on a panning apparatus (50) said panning apparatus being mounted in or on said flat holding element.

Regarding claim 35, Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, wherein said camera is mounted on a panning apparatus (50).

Although claim 44 recites purely functional limitations, it is nonetheless rejected because Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, wherein all of said caster axles are adapted to be rotated and to be fixed in said horizontal plane in any desired rotary position.

Although claim 45 recites purely functional limitations, it is nonetheless rejected because Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, wherein said casters can be locked in a rotating direction thereof (via wing nut 20).

Regarding claim 49, Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, wherein three of said casters are provided and arranged at an angular spacing of 120° about said vertical axis (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 50, Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, comprising at least one bearing element in which one of said caster axles is fitted, said at least one bearing element (ring surrounding caster wheel in Fig. 1) being detachably connected to said holding element.

Regarding claim 51, as best understood, Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, wherein at least one of said caster axles is supported in a bearing ring element (ring

surrounding caster wheel in Fig. 1) provided on an outside of said holding element, such that it can rotate in said horizontal plane.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

14. Claims 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beidler et al. (U.S. Pat. 1,550,944).

Regarding claims 36-41, Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, but does not teach that the running direction adjusting device comprises markings, a scale, a digital display, an incremental encoder or a direction finding element that indicates said rotary position of said running direction of said at least one caster axle with reference to said holding element at a reference mark, where the scale has a special marking to indicate a desired position. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Beidler where the

running direction adjusting device comprises markings, a scale with markings, digital display, incremental encoder or direction finding element that indicates said rotary position of said running direction of said at least one caster axle with reference to said holding element at a reference mark, where the scale has a special marking to indicate a desired position because the use of a scale with a special mark, digital display, incremental encoder or direction finding element would yield the predictable results of measuring or monitoring the position or location of the caster wheels.

15. Claims 42, 43, 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beidler et al. (U.S. Pat. 1,550,944) in view of Cox (U.S. Pat. 6,484,829).

Regarding claims 42, 43 and 52-54, as best understood, Beidler teaches the system of claims 33 and 34, but does not teach that the running direction adjusting device comprises at least one motor that is controlled by a CPU, a rotary movement of at least one of said casters about a caster axle thereof can be driven by means of a motor, a speed of said rotary movement is controlled by a central CPU, and the horizontal panning movements and/or said vertical tilting movements of said camera in said panning apparatus are performed by means of motors that can be controlled by a central CPU. Cox, however, teaches that a motor (520) can control a caster actuator (521), a caster (52) and other members, wherein the motor is controlled by a central processing system (801). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to construct the system of Beidler where a motor controls the running direction adjusting device, a rotary movement of at least one of said casters about a caster axle thereof, a speed of said rotary movement, and the horizontal

panning movements and/or said vertical tilting movements of said camera in said panning apparatus, where the motor is controlled by a central CPU in order to provide an automatic means for controlling the system.

16. Claims 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beidler et al. (U.S. Pat. 1,550,944) in view of Lewin (U.S. Pat. 3,566,433).

Regarding claims 46, 47 and 48, Beidler teaches the system of claims 33 and 37, but does not teach that an adjusting device is provided for adjusting a friction between at least one of said casters and a caster axle thereof and a damping device is provided for damping a friction between at least one of said casters and said caster axle thereof. Lewin, however, teaches a caster arrangement where an adjusting device (45) is provided for adjusting a friction between at least one of said casters and a caster axle thereof and a damping device (44) is provided for damping a friction between at least one of said casters and said caster axle thereof in order to reduce the damaging effect of sudden shocks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to construct the system of Beidler where an adjusting device is provided for adjusting a friction between at least one of said casters and a caster axle thereof and a damping device is provided for damping a friction between at least one of said casters and said caster axle thereof in order to prevent an abrupt change in the caster angle.

Further, Beidler and Lewin disclose the claimed invention except for a damping level of the damping device being adjustable. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a damping level of

the damping device as adjustable since the provision of adjustability, where needed, involves only routine skill in the art.

17. Claims 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beidler et al. (U.S. Pat. 1,550,944) in view of Epperson (U.S. Pat. 3,924,828).

Regarding claim 56, Beidler teaches the system of claim 33, but does not teach that the panning apparatus comprises an L-shaped holder on a fastening column. Epperson, however, teaches a panning apparatus comprising an L-shaped holder (30) on a fastening column (26) for mounting the camera. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to substitute the panning apparatus of Beidler for the panning apparatus of Epperson since both devices perform the same function of moving the camera.

Regarding claims 57 and 58, Beidler and Epperson teach the device of claim 56, where Epperson teaches that said fastening column is mounted on a bearing ring (22) that is supported in a holding element (14) and said fastening column can be removed together with said L-shaped holder.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NKEISHA J. DUMAS whose telephone number is (571)272-5781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. Allen Shriver can be reached on (571) 272-6698. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nkeisha J. Dumas/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3632

February 17, 2009

/J. ALLEN SHRIVER II/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3632